

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending; Claims 4 through 13 are deemed allowable by the Examiner. The Office Action dated January 25, 2005 regarding this Application has been carefully considered. The Examiner determined that Applicants' Amendment filed August 18, 2004 and September 30, 2004, which attempted to combine limitations from Claim 3 into Claim 1 was not fully responsive.

An interview was held with the Examiner, Mr. David Ton, on August 20, 2004, to discuss the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and proposed amendments to Claim 1. Applicants' representative wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended.

Initially, Applicants note that the August 18, 2004 "Amendment" was an informal "proposed" amendment which was used for discussion purposes during the telephone interview held on August 20, 2004. This informal proposed amendment was followed by the formal Amendment dated September 30, 2004. Accordingly, the following will address the asserted non-responsiveness of the formal Amendment dated September 30, 2004, which responded to the Official Action dated June 28, 2004.

The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks for those Claims deemed not in condition for allowance.

In the Official Action dated June 28, 2004, the Examiner indicated that Claims 4-13 are in condition for the allowance. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by U.S. Patent No. 4,811,345 by Johnson ("Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,604,888 by Kiana-Shabestari et al. ("Kiana"). Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is overcome.

Regarding Claim 1, Johnson was cited as assertedly fully disclosing an apparatus for testing one or more processors, and controlling the input to the one or more processors. Kiana was cited as assertedly fully disclosing a reconfigurable interface, including a motherboard means connected to a host computer means through an interface means. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to combine teachings of Johnson and Kiana in order to provide a reconfigurable interface for testing a microprocessor.

In the June 28, 2004 Official Action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 3 was being objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has not, however, pointed to any particular reference that discloses each of the separate limitations of Claim 3. Accordingly, it is Applicants position that adding to Claim 1 any of the limitations of dependent Claim 3 is sufficient to render Claim 1 patentable.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, taken from Claim 3, namely, “*wherein the test motherboard means further comprises an Arbiter and Traffic Generator means for controlling a motherboard bus on the test motherboard means.*” (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, on page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 24 of the original Application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the prior art of record.

Johnson is directed to a microprocessor test interface having a plurality of CPU control pins. Kiana is directed to the use of daughterboards connecting to a motherboard for use with field programmable gate arrays. However, Johnson in view of Kiani does not disclose, teach or suggest “wherein the test motherboard means further comprises an Arbiter and Traffic Generator means for

controlling a motherboard bus on the test motherboard means.” An advantage that amended Claim 1 innovatively provides is allowing for flexibility in controlling a bus, such as a motherboard bus, and generating interrupts/traffic based upon an instruction, memory mapped values, an address, and/or the like. Amended Claim 1 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by either Johnson or Kiana, either singularly or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over these references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Johnson in view of Kiana be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claim 3 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim should also be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of the dependent Claim 3 also be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Johnson in view of Kiana in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,263,139 to Testa et al. (“Testa”). Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is overcome.

Claim 2 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of the dependent Claim 2 also be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present Amendment is fully responsive to the Official Action dated June 28, 2004 and addresses the asserted bases for the asserted non-responsiveness cited in the Official Action dated January 25, 2005.


Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-13. Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: 2/24/05
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003


Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093